DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 748 EA 028 316

AUTHOR Martin, Earin M.
TITLE Conditions That Facilitate the School Restructuring Process: Perceptions of Educational Personnel in Restructured Schools.
PUB DATE Jan 97
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (20th, Austin, TX, January 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; *Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Climate; Program Implementation; Resistance to Change; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

Proponents of school restructuring agree that it must occur with support from all stakeholder groups. This paper presents findings of a study that examined to what extent educational personnel engaged in restructuring (principals, teachers, and external facilitators of change) agreed or disagreed that 60 conditions identified in the research literature facilitated restructuring of their school. The study also examined the degree of consensus among and within the three groups on the conditions they believed to be most difficult to achieve in the restructuring process. A survey of 303 educational personnel in the Texas Partnership Schools Initiative elicited a total of 256 responses (67 principals, 172 teachers, and 17 facilitators), almost an 85 percent response rate. Principals consistently identified the following conditions as most difficult to achieve: cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel; ability of the staff to deal with other staff who resist change; adequate time and technical support for teachers; time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, or team planning; and sufficient district funds to carry out restructuring initiatives. Two of the conditions identified as most critical to restructuring were also identified as the most difficult to achieve: (1) cooperation and trust among all levels; and (2) time during regular working hours. A conclusion is that those involved in restructuring should mutually determine the level, degree, or extent of the presence of the conditions that will be acceptable to all involved and then should continuously monitor the degree of presence of the conditions. Implications for external facilitators, partnerships, pilot program and practices, and leadership are highlighted. A copy of the questionnaire is included. (Contains 92 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 748

CONDITIONS THAT FACILITATE THE SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PROCESS: PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL IN RESTRUCTURED SCHOOLS

Earin Miller Martin, Ed.D.
University of Texas at Austin

Paper presented at the 20th annual meeting of the
Southwest Educational Research Association
January 23-25, 1997
Austin, Texas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. M. Martin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 028 316

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONDITIONS THAT FACILITATE THE SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING PROCESS: PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL IN RESTRUCTURED SCHOOLS

Background

Over the last decade the rhetoric of school improvement has changed from a language of school reform to a language of school restructuring (Darling-Hammond, 1993, p. 753).

Educational reform of the last 15 years is generally described by education analysts as consisting of two movements. The first movement occurring within this time frame was actually launched in the late 1970s and given further impetus in 1983 by the National Commission on Educational Excellence's *A Nation At Risk* (Tushnet, 1991). Known as the "excellence" movement (O'Neil, 1990) or "standards-raising" movement (Murphy, 1993), it was a top-down set of national and state initiatives targeted toward increasing student graduation requirements, strengthening teacher preparation and certification standards, and lengthening the school year.

Shortly thereafter, a powerful report by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) called for the "restructuring" of schools to provide for a professional environment for teachers in which to make decisions about how best to educate their children to achieve the state and local educational goals established for them. It also called for the need to better prepare teachers to teach students of the 21st century.

By the time this landmark Carnegie Report was issued in 1986, education analysts had already concluded that the "excellence movement" would not accomplish the needed fundamental changes in learning and teaching (O'Neil, 1990) in the American public school system. Such fundamental changes "would only come through a new phase of reform directed toward changing the very heart of the teaching and learning process" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 6) that combined both content and process (McLaughlin, 1990) with accompanying changes in the school structure (Cornett, 1995).

Thus, the "restructuring" movement took its place in the sequence of educational reform mechanisms and the term "restructuring" became the current watchword of the

educational reform rhetoric. Current restructuring rhetoric, however, results in confusion and ambiguity among school personnel endeavoring to put the pieces of the restructuring puzzle together. The literature reflects many different definitions and conceptions of restructuring, ranging from very narrow in scope and meaning to very comprehensive and broad in scope and meaning, resulting in the lack of a clear definition that everyone can agree upon. While some education analysts contend this is a major weakness of the movement, others contend the very strength of restructuring is that it does not provide pat answers (David, 1991b).

Some school leaders believe they have restructured if they have implemented site-based management (Aronstein, Marlow, and Desilets, 1990). Others believe they have restructured if they have "empowered" the teachers to make many of the curricular and instructional decisions that directly impact the students they teach (Wise, 1990). Still others see restructuring as the addition of what they believe to be innovative instructional programs and strategies.

But the implementation of restructuring as defined under one of these narrow tenets remains reflective of the piecemeal reform efforts of the 1980s, which, in isolation, are considered to be largely unsuccessful in increasing student achievement. Murphy (1991) sees site-based management and teacher empowerment only as *strategies* employed in *comprehensive* restructuring, not as elements that constitute restructuring in and of themselves.

The *comprehensive* view of restructuring, in contrast, embodies a complete overhaul in the educational system, a fundamental transformation and permanent alteration of the institutional structures (Cuban, 1992). Restructuring involves second-order changes commonly characterized by decentralized decision making from the state level to the classroom; new forms of organization, governance, and management of schools; new roles and responsibilities for all members of the community; and an infusion of constructivist approaches to teaching and learning into classrooms (Murphy, 1993).

Recent research has shown that the "how" of improvement, as opposed to the "what" of improvement, is emerging as the most important question related to successful school reform (Pajak and Glickman, 1989). But there is little agreement among

proponents of restructuring about how to implement comprehensive, systemic restructuring (Timar, 1989).

Donahoe (1993) reflects on the inadequacy of the school improvement and school effectiveness literature, and even the initial restructuring literature, in confronting the question of "how" do schools generate and sustain the characteristics of effectiveness. In spite of the lists of desired characteristics and states of effective schools, what seems to be missing from the puzzle is how a restructured school differs from a traditional school in the way it functions (Donahoe, 1993). What lacks is the identification of a "commitment strategy", the "conditions and strategies capable of engaging school people in persistent efforts to expand that knowledge and to act on it" (Leithwood, et. al., 1993, p. 88).

The literature demonstrates that schools that have made progress in restructuring have a balance of both external conditions (David, 1991b; Leithwood, et. al., 1993) and internal conditions from the state, district, and campus level that support change (Barth, 1990; United States Department of Education, 1995). Barth (1990) assumes that schools have the capacity to improve themselves if the *conditions* are right; he also assumes that a major responsibility of those outside the school is to help provide these conditions for those inside the school.

School improvement is the process of determining and providing internal and external conditions which promote and sustain adult and student learning (Barth, 1990). Unless a school is prepared to make tangible changes in conditions in order to support staff in working towards established priorities for school improvement, little progress can be anticipated (Hopkins, Ainscow, and West, 1994). The elements of change must become inherent within the school and the district, "enabling the school to stand substantially by itself, or school improvement efforts will eventually collapse" (Donahoe, 1993, p. 305). David (1991b) reinforces this notion.

> For restructuring to succeed, educators and policymakers must understand these conditions; otherwise, restructuring will follow the well-worn path of failed reforms, creating a handful of extraordinary schools instead of the conditions that would allow most schools to become extraordinary (p. 12).

What the Literature Says About the Conditions that Facilitate the School Restructuring Process

Lessons learned from previous reform efforts combine with knowledge of the educational change process to formulate innumerable positions and perspectives from various authors about what factors or conditions facilitate the school restructuring process. Although authors differ in their opinions about the conditions they believe facilitate the restructuring process, they overwhelmingly agree with the notion that schools cannot restructure without the support of others.

First and foremost, proponents of restructuring agree that restructuring cannot occur in isolation. It must occur with support from the school district and state department of education through meaningful partnerships with parents, community members, colleges and universities, and representatives of the business community. And it must occur with the assistance of internal and external facilitators who have knowledge of the change process.

A review of the vast amount of literature on the processes of school restructuring, effective schools, school improvement, educational reform, and educational revealed the conditions that facilitate the school restructuring process can be organized into eight primary themes or clusters. Influenced by Eastwood and Louis' (1992) "performance dip model", which "attempts to capture the problem-rich character of a restructuring effort and the manageability of the process of change over time (p. 214), these areas, further adapted by the author of this study, are (1) an environment for change; (2) an internal and external change facilitator with the knowledge of the change process; (3) vision; (4) planning; (5) support/leadership for restructuring and corresponding role changes; (6) commitment to restructuring through the provision of resources, professional development, and attention to new roles; (7) partnerships; and (8) assessment of restructuring initiatives.

It was recognized early, however, that these noninstructional "process" issues must be viewed as prerequisites to instructional changes, rather than as ends in themselves (Shoemaker, 1986). For example, a climate of collegiality and risk-taking does little or nothing to improve student achievement if teachers do nothing to change instructional

practices in the classroom. There is a separate and significant body of literature on effective teaching practices that is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, the final and ninth theme only briefly discussed is the need for simultaneous changes in teaching and learning.

Following is a brief synopsis of the major issues discussed in the literature related to each of these nine themes. The items in the questionnaire developed for use in the study were clustered according to these same nine themes.

(1) An Environment for Change

> *Fear in the workplace is a barrier to innovative change . . . bureaucratic systems, which reward adherence to the status quo and discourage attempts at systemic change, . . . feed the fear and mistrust permeating our work place. . . . many people in the public schools fear change and often distrust those individuals who do not. Even if the changes are research-based and earnestly enacted, the inherent mechanisms in bureaucracies for squelching growth may manifest themselves in the form of censure, disdain, or nonsupport (Leibensperger, 1994, p. 105).*

Changes must be made in the structure of schooling that will lead teachers to *seek* changes in instruction rather than *imposing* changes in instruction on them (Education Commission of the States and the Rockefeller Foundation, 1990). Thus, the single most important factor for successful restructuring is a "cooperative internal environment" (Eastwood and Louis, 1992) that is friendly to change (Education Commission of the States, 1992b). A cooperative environment is demonstrated through administrators and teachers working in harmony to solve problems and resolve conflict through extensive communication and collaboration with all constituency groups (Eastwood and Louis, 1992).

Trust

Recent research on state reform initiatives reveals that the lack of trust is an enormous problem and may be the most difficult to overcome if reform efforts are to be successful (SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1994). Trust among stakeholders must be established in order to ready them for change (Bredeson, 1993;

Hoffman, et. al., 1994; Murphy, 1991). Principals and teachers must have trust in and respect for each other (Corcoran and Rouk, 1985; Evans, 1993; Hoffman, et. al., 1994) as well as in the restructuring processes themselves and must trust that the changes will have a positive effect on the desired outcomes (Bredeson, 1993).

Risk-taking and Innovation

Teachers and administrators "need a protected atmosphere in which to develop and test new, complex authority relationships and school practices" (MacPhail-Wilcox, Forbes, and Parramore, 1990, p. 25). Thus, a sincere invitation to change that encourages people "to act on their knowledge and understanding of what needs changing, and to take responsibility for the successes and failures" (Elmore, 1988, p. 9) is perhaps the most critical aspect of leadership at the state, district, and campus levels (David, 1991b). A nonthreatening educational environment that rewards risk-taking and encourages experimentation and even failure must be provided (Carruthers, 1990; Fernandez, 1991).

Collaboration and Communication

It is only through a collaborative environment that fosters ongoing conversations among teachers (United States Department of Education, 1991) that teachers will be truly empowered to make the necessary changes in their classrooms (P. Short, 1994). In addition, systems cannot improve without a communication and feedback infrastructure for sharing knowledge, information and problems among all stakeholders (David, 1994).

Capacity to Identify and Solve Problems

The ability to cope with problems actively, promptly, and with some depth is a strong determinant of the success of school improvement initiatives (Louis and Miles, 1990). Problem-solving capacity, which requires teachers and administrators to think critically and reflectively, is enhanced by a collaborative culture in which staff view the organization as a learning and self-correcting institution (United States Department of Education, 1991). An ideal setting for collaborative problem solving is the collaborative or collective planning process.

(2) An Internal and External Change Facilitator with Knowledge of the Change Process

Support for restructuring comes from the complementary skills and knowledge of facilitators both external and internal to the organization who support local efforts (Busick and Inos, 1992). Early comprehensive studies in the implementation of innovations undeniably concluded that "implementation was far greater in situations that involved external and internal facilitators than in situations in which only an external facilitator was involved" (Huberman and Crandall, 1982, in Fullan, 1985, p. 407).

External Facilitators

Early lessons in restructuring reveal that outside facilitation by skilled, sensitive, and experienced people is a powerful intervention in any restructuring effort. External facilitators help those involved in restructuring learn how to communicate, take leadership, focus on tasks, reach agreement, make decisions, and keep on track with restructuring initiatives (Lieberman, Darling-Hammond, and Zuckerman, 1991). Their purpose is to create a sense of community and provide a nurturing environment (Killion and Simmons, 1992) in which to "help find answers and shape outcomes, not to give or determine either" (Fox, 1992, p. 75). External facilitators must believe in and trust the group's ability to find its own direction and resolution while assuming the group's perspective rather than their own (Killion and Simmons, 1992).

Internal Facilitators

Emerging in early research as pivotal to the implementation of change (Loucks, et. al., 1982), internal facilitators, also known as local facilitators, are considered by some proponents of restructuring to be essential to the change process. Whether a district-level person from central office, a principal, or a teacher leader, an internal facilitator who plays "the role of the champion or advocate (for change) is crucial at the front end of change efforts" (Fox, 1992, p. 74). Internal facilitators support the change process by serving as a link to outside sources in identifying persons within or near the district who can lend support to restructuring efforts (Busick and Inos, 1992).

Knowledge of the Change Process

Knowledge and understanding of the change process, or the lack thereof, will determine the success or failure of restructuring efforts (Peca, 1994). Educational leaders, including external and internal facilitators of change, who wish to make comprehensive restructuring happen, therefore, must be aware of the general research findings on the topic of change. According to Sarason (1972, in Heckman, 1993), the best that anyone can do to facilitate the change process is to "create the conditions for teachers, the principal, and the parents of a school to change themselves and their setting" (p. 267). Creating the conditions for change requires knowledge and skill on the part of everyone, in particular teachers, to manage the change process.

Because culture has been identified as a significant barrier to change, conditions for change must also include an understanding of the school's culture and how an organization's culture affects change (Bell, 1993; Evans, 1993; Reitzug, 1994). Because of the ambiguous nature of restructuring, conditions for change must include a clear and shared understanding on the part of the staff of what restructuring means to them and what the associated changes will entail (Eastwood and Louis, 1992; Goldwasser, 1993).

(3) Vision

> *A district may operate smoothly without vision, and may even improve; but the improvement will be episodic, directionless, and noncumulative. Restructuring is systemic, and systemic change requires a vision (Corbett, 1990, p. 3).*

Strategic reform is not possible until an organization has critically examined the goals of education (Bacharach, 1988) and has developed a vision that "anchors and gives meaning to the whole" (Education Commission of the States, 1992a, 1992b) while providing a picture of what it wants to look like in the future (Elmore, 1988). Therefore, the commitment to a clear and purposeful shared vision that is developed collectively by all stakeholders in the system and engages stakeholders in an ongoing improvement process (Blum and Kneidek, 1991; Eastwood and Louis, 1992) and that focuses on desired outcomes (Education Commission of the States, 1992a) is one of the first steps

and necessary components of the restructuring process (Carruthers, 1990; Johnson, Snyder, and Anderson, 1992).

(4) Planning

Although vision gives reform direction and guides practice, it is not enough in itself to ensure success. The vision must be supported by a set of specific strategies for reform (Education Commission of the States, 1992a) that are detailed in a collectively developed plan for change shaped by all partners (Johnson, Snyder, and Anderson, 1992). Wide participation in the development of the plan will help ensure that the plan is carried out (*Closer*, 1994). Such a plan for restructuring broadens with consensus among staff through implementation and is critical to the institutionalization of restructuring initiatives (Eastwood and Louis, 1992).

Prerequisite to formal planning is the necessity for staff to assess whether the proposed changes are really necessary, why it is important, and how the changes will improve the school (Newmann, 1991). Equally important is addressing the needs of the individual school (Tushnet, 1991).

(5) Support/Leadership for Restructuring and Corresponding Role Changes

Restructuring requires educational personnel at the state level, district level, and campus level to alter their roles and relationships to provide the necessary support and leadership for successful restructuring. Vagueness or uncertainty of the understanding of these new roles and relationships hinders the ability of schools to satisfactorily proceed through the change process (Prestine and Bowen, 1993).

State Level

> *If reform efforts are to take root at the local level, states must be prepared to give communities greater authority over the process of reform and to work with them in addressing specific local needs and challenges. States are going to have to become working partners with local communities and school districts. But first the states are going to have to reassess their own roles and*

responsibilities in improving the quality of public education (Kilbourne, Decker, and Romney, 1994, p. 57).

Because a regulatory and compliance mentality on the part of state and district leadership is one of the major barriers to local reform (David, 1994), the role of the state in the systemic restructuring of schools is redefined and reorganized from a traditional role of generating and mandating rules and monitoring, to one of enabling, nurturing and assisting long-term restructuring efforts (David, et. al., 1990) by providing flexibility, encouraging experimentation and risk-taking (Darling-Hammond, 1993); supporting high-quality, sustained professional development (David, 1994); decentralizing decision making (Murphy, 1990); recognizing the importance of providing sufficient time to realize the effects of restructuring initiatives and time for involving teachers in restructuring activities (David, et. al., 1990); aligning evaluation and accountability criteria with new images of teaching and learning (David, 1994); and researching and disseminating results to other schools (Cohen, 1988; Dagley, 1993).

States support restructuring by replacing old policies that hinder restructuring with new policies that serve as catalysts for restructuring (Goldwasser, 1993); by including provisions for waivers from restrictive rules and regulations that work against reform efforts (Dagley, 1993); and by identifying pilot sites and providing the time and resources for piloting programs and processes in which schools are provided the opportunity to fail as well as to succeed (Carruthers, 1990; David, et. al., 1990; and Murphy, 1991).

District Level

The roles of the local school board, superintendent, and central office staff change from one of directing to one of supporting and providing leadership for school restructuring initiatives. These groups also play a key role in the implementation of site-based decision making, considered by some proponents of restructuring to be the core of restructuring efforts (Bell, 1993; *Closer*, 1994). Widespread involvement in decisions requires the development of unfamiliar roles and new power relationships (Mentell, 1993), which requires long-term, ongoing professional development for all parties involved, and

nurturing to perform those new roles (Hall and Galluzzo, 1991; Murphy, 1993; Odden and Wohlstetter, 1995).

Campus Level

At the heart of restructuring is creating new roles and redefining existing roles and responsibilities of the principal, teachers, and students (Anderson, 1993; Bredeson, 1993; Tushnet, 1991) from "a hierarchical structure of control to one of support and shared decision making" (Anderson, 1993, p. 15). Principals assume the role of adviser, coach, and teammate to teachers (Bernd, 1992; Bonstingl, 1992; and Bredeson, 1993) while ensuring a positive climate to gain commitment to restructuring (Caldwell and Wood, 1988).

Teachers in restructuring schools assume new roles and responsibilities such as scheduling of students, developing curriculum, participating in and conducting staff development, and team planning and coordination (Tushnet, 1991). Through a sense of self-efficacy (faith in their own ability to effect learning through improved practices) (Bernd, 1992; Murphy, 1991), teachers in restructuring schools think of themselves as advisers and teammates to students (Bonstingl, 1992; Newmann, 1993) in creating classroom strategies that enable learning through a variety of instructional strategies (Rowley, 1991) that fully develop student potential (Short and Greer, 1994).

Students in restructuring schools must also become empowered through an increased sense of responsibility for an organization (Newman, 1992) to assume their new role as "worker" and take active responsibility for their own learning in becoming independent, lifelong learners (Short and Greer, 1994). Student involvement in decision making and school improvement processes breaks down traditional control mechanisms by uniting leaders and followers and reinforces behaviors that contribute to a positive school culture as students begin to believe they have some control over their environment (Newman, 1992).

(6) Commitment to Restructuring Through the Provision of Resources, Professional Development, and Attention to New Roles

Commitment to restructuring is developed and maintained through the provision of resources and attention to the new roles, relationships, and responsibilities that accompany structural changes, governance changes, and changes in teaching and learning.

Resources

> *Once the agenda (for restructuring) is set, the greatest aid to rapid change is resources -- both financial and technical (David, et. al., 1990, p. 42).*

Cumulative research indicates that resources do, in fact, make a difference (Thompson, 1992) in school improvement efforts. Resources nourish commitment to restructuring (Evans, 1993) and include time, money, and professional development and technical assistance.

Identified as the primary obstacle to school reform (National School Board Association, 1993) and the most bothersome aspect of restructuring (Murphy, 1993), time is among the most frequently mentioned factors critical to the success of restructuring and one that most people underestimate the amount required. Money is also identified as a major resource for restructuring. Some proponents of restructuring contend that additional money is a cornerstone of not only initiating restructuring initiatives but of maintaining restructured schools (Bredeson, 1993; Murphy, 1991, 1993c). Schools cannot be misled into thinking that time for restructuring and access to knowledge does not translate into dollars (David, et. al., 1990).

The integration of technology as an instructional or assessment tool as well as an information tool is also considered by many proponents of restructuring as a resource and necessary condition for facilitating the restructuring process. "Together, restructuring and the new technologies are a far more powerful force for change than either would be alone" (David, 1991a, p. 38).

Early research on school improvement significantly concludes that change lives and dies by the amount of staff development and technical assistance it receives (Huberman

and Crandall, 1982, in Clark, Lotto, and Astuto, 1984, p. 58). Thus, an equally critical, if not the most critical, resource for restructuring is concentrated, ongoing, and widespread professional development and technical assistance for all members of the educational system (Corbett 1990). Staff development must focus on the "content" of restructuring as well as on the "context" or process of restructuring.

(7) Partnerships

The restructuring literature is replete with the notion that schools cannot restructure to better prepare students for the 21st century without support from and collaboration with a coalition of diverse partners who have a stake in education and who fully participate in decision making and work with the system in identifying and making the needed changes (Anderson, 1993; Coppedge, 1993; Slotnik, 1993). The partnership metaphor serves to expand the school community, "to unite parents, professional educators, businesses, universities, foundations, and the general populace into a collective force" (Murphy, 1991, p. 45) to effect long-term, coherent, well-planned comprehensive reform in the entire system that will enable all students to achieve to higher standards (Education Commission of the States, 1992c).

If students are to reach their full potential, parents must engage in authentic interaction and collaboration with schools in being exposed to meaningful, "culturally responsive" (Banks, 1993) parental involvement activities that focus on the learning and socialization of their children in the home (Mannan and Blackwell, 1992). Because they have a high stake in the quality of graduates produced by high schools, representatives of the business sector should be invited into the system to become full partners through participation in advisory committees, leadership cadres and councils to help restructure and redesign elements of the program (Fernandez, 1991). Finally, Manual Gomez of the University of California at Irving stated that partnerships between schools and universities are the vehicles that will drive profound and fundamental change in American education (Pitsch, 1991).

(8) Assessment of Restructuring Initiatives

Because the restructuring of a school is likely to be a five- to ten-year process, it is critical that some form of continual monitoring or formative evaluation process (Fullan, 1985) to measure progress toward meeting the objectives and intended outcomes of restructuring initiatives and provide feedback (Eastwood and Louis, 1992) be provided through a variety of formal and informal communication and interaction strategies (Fullan, 1985). Accountability for the results of decisions made by teachers and other stakeholders at the school site is mentioned frequently in the literature as one of the cornerstones of restructuring. Central to the notion of restructuring is that the community, district, and state "share" accountability for results (David, 1991b; Sashkin and Egermeier, 1992; United States Department of Education, 1991).

Not only must schools and districts employ multiple methods for measuring the success of restructuring efforts and improvement in student achievement, but they must also formalize the celebration of successes (Donaldson, 1993; Tushnet, 1991).

(9) Changes in Teaching and Learning

Education analysts contend that all of the structural and process changes discussed above will be meaningless in the strife to increase commitment and competence for effective teaching and, in isolation, are unlikely to improve education (Murphy, 1993; Newmann, 1993; Slotnik, 1993). What is taught and how it is taught must also change if the structural and process changes are going to have more than minimal effect (David, et al., 1990). Thus, while schools may implement site-based decision making, accountability structures, and engage in staff development to accomplish role changes associated with restructuring, without concordant changes in teaching and learning at the classroom level, all of these other elements of restructuring will not in and of themselves produce the desired changes in student learning (Goldwasser, 1993; Kirst, 1993).

Schools engaged in comprehensive, systemic restructuring are rethinking their curriculum and instructional methods to make learning more interesting and challenging

for students (United States Department of Education, 1995) and emphasize teaching for understanding and authentic learning (Newmann, 1993). Districts and campuses are encouraged to apply what is known about teachers and teaching, about learning, and about school improvement and to rely on research and proven practices in determining restructuring strategies (Glickman, 1991).

Purpose of the Study

Thousands of school districts and campuses across the nation are struggling to put together the pieces of the restructuring puzzle with the intent and hope of increasing student achievement and professionalizing the role of teachers. However, educators attempting restructuring are forced to wade through an enormous volume of primarily theory-based literature that is full of ambiguity and that lacks unity and clarity on "process" issues related to comprehensive, systemic school restructuring. The result is, "Those who wish to study school restructuring must make sense out of the countless attempts to initiate restructuring without a theory to guide their work" (Porter and Osthoff, 1993, p. 49).

There is a need, then, to unify and clarify for teachers, principals, and other school personnel the voluminous literature about restructuring to ultimately identify a comprehensive set of internal and external conditions that facilitate systemic restructuring that can serve as a practical guide to personnel and other stakeholders engaging in restructuring. In response to this need, a study was conducted under the supervision of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Texas at Austin to integrate some of the lessons learned from past reform efforts with current literature and research on restructuring to avoid yet another era of failure by focusing on the identification of a set of internal and external conditions that facilitate the school restructuring process. The study focused on the "context" or process of restructuring, and not the "content" of restructuring.

The study examined to what extent educational personnel engaged in restructuring (in particular, principals, teachers, and external facilitators of change) agreed or disagreed, based on their own experience with restructuring, that conditions identified in the

literature facilitated the comprehensive restructuring process at their own school site. The study also examined the degree of consensus among the three role groups as well as within the three groups on the conditions they believe to be most critical to the school restructuring process and on the conditions they believe to be most difficult to achieve in the restructuring process. Thus, the study focused on the following questions:

1. To what extent do teachers, principals, and external facilitators of change agree or disagree that conditions for restructuring identified in the literature facilitate the school restructuring process?
2. What conditions do teachers, principals, and external facilitators believe are most critical to the school restructuring process and are most difficult to achieve?
3. Is there consensus **among** teachers, principals, and external facilitators on the conditions they believe to be most critical to the school restructuring process and on the conditions they believe to be most difficult to achieve?
4. Is there consensus **within** each group, i.e., teachers, principals, and external facilitators, on the conditions they believe to be most critical to the school restructuring process and on the conditions they believe to be most difficult to achieve?

   More specifically:

   a) Is there consensus among **teachers** based on the total number of years teaching and total number of years at their current school?
   b) Is there consensus among **principals** based on number of years teaching, number of years as principal, and number of years as principal at their current school?
   c) Is there consensus among **facilitators** based on number of years teaching, number of years as principal, number of years as facilitator, and number of years at central office?
   d) Is there consensus among **teachers** or among **principals** based on their current level of assignment, i.e., prekindergarten/elementary school; middle/junior high school; or high school?

e) Is there consensus among teachers, among principals, or among facilitators based on gender?

Ultimately, the purpose of the study was two-fold: (a) to determine whether educational personnel engaged in restructuring agreed that the conditions identified in the literature facilitate the school restructuring process and (b) to determine a set of conditions educational personnel engaged in restructuring believe to be most critical to the school restructuring process and a set of conditions they believe to be most difficult to achieve, irrespective of a particular role group (i. e., principal, teacher, or facilitator) or a particular characteristic of a member of a role group (i. e., number of years teaching, number of years as principal, number of years at the current school, etc.).

Definitions

The following operational definitions provided the framework for developing, designing, administering, and analyzing the results of the questionnaire used in the study.

School restructuring is the simultaneous redesign and reorganization of every facet of schooling, including school organization, governance, authority, decision making, curriculum, instruction, technology, assessment, and accountability, and every level of the educational system, from the state level to the classroom, to improve student achievement and to professionalize the role and responsibilities of teachers

The **school restructuring process** means the continuing development of many steps or operations that a school engages in to restructure the school. Process deals with the context, the background or environment relative to a particular event, and addresses "how" a school restructures. It does not address the "what" or content of restructuring.

Conditions that facilitate the school restructuring process means those essential factors that make the school restructuring process easier and lessen resistance to change.

Conditions most critical to the restructuring process means those conditions that, to the greatest degree, affect the restructuring process.

Conditions most difficult to achieve means those conditions that, to the greatest degree, are hardest to do or to accomplish, often requiring extra effort, skill, or thought to manage or understand.

Methodology

Primarily quantitative data with limited supplemental qualitative data were collected through the use of a self-administered mail questionnaire developed by the researcher. The questionnaire was developed and finalized using information obtained from a review of the literature and subsequent development of a comprehensive set of conditions that restructuring authors contend facilitate the restructuring process; face-to-face interviews; critical review of the draft of the questionnaire with coworkers; and piloting of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire contained 60 conditions derived from a review of the literature on school restructuring, effective schools, school improvement, educational reform, and educational change. The 60 conditions were grouped by the researcher according to nine overarching themes or clusters identified in the literature. (These are the same nine categories previously summarized.) Participants were instructed to indicate on a five-point Likert scale (Borg and Gall, 1989, p. 311; Gay, 1992, p. 173) the extent to which they strongly agreed, agreed, are undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed, based on their own experience with restructuring, that each of the conditions facilitates the school restructuring process. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha indicated the internal consistency of the questionnaire to be .96.

Participants were also instructed, from the 60 conditions previously identified, to choose six conditions and to rank them from the most critical to the sixth most critical to the school restructuring process. Participants were also instructed to choose six conditions and to rank them from the most difficult to the sixth most difficult to achieve, based on their own experiences with restructuring. These two questions provided substantive information for analysis and comparison among and within the three role groups participating in the study. Finally, the questionnaire contained questions to obtain demographic data as well as a single open-ended question which asked the participant to write about his/her own experience with restructuring and what he/she believed to be important for the process to be successful to provide supplemental data of a qualitative nature. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

Sample

The questionnaire was mailed to 303 educational personnel in the Texas Partnership Schools Initiative, including 80 principals, 204 teachers, and 19 Partnership Schools facilitators at the regional education service centers. The 80 Texas Partnership Schools selected for participation in the study were established by former Texas Commissioner of Education Lionel R. Meno to promote comprehensive restructuring at the individual campus level. Campuses that had demonstrated a willingness to support radical change and encourage risk-taking in schools and to redefine their relationships to promote sustained school-based reform over a period of time (Sa, 1992) through innovative leaders, committed staff, supportive local school boards, and involved communities were sought to participate in the Partnership Schools Initiative. At the time this study was conducted (Fall 1995), the Partnership Schools were the only group of schools in Texas that were receiving support in the form of funds for staff development and leadership from the state and regional level for the specific purpose of restructuring. Thus, the Partnership Schools provided an ideal "laboratory" in which to identify the conditions that facilitate the school restructuring process.

Data Analysis

The means and standard deviation were calculated for each of the 60 items (or conditions) in the questionnaire. A single-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the mean scores for the three groups (teachers, principals, and facilitators) to determine if they significantly differed from one another, where $p < .05$. For those items that were statistically significant, a Scheffe post hoc analysis with an alpha level of .05 was conducted to determine if the difference was between principals and teachers, teachers and facilitators, and/or principals and facilitators.

Additionally, the 60 items (conditions) in the questionnaire are grouped according to nine overarching themes identified in the literature to form nine clusters of items (outlined previously in the synopsis of the review of the literature). Therefore, to allow for comparison of responses among the three role groups for each of the nine clusters, the same procedure was used (i.e., a single factor ANOVA to compare the mean scores for

the three role groups with a Scheffe post hoc analysis for those clusters that were statistically significant at the same levels).

Frequency distributions were calculated for the items that dealt with the ranking from one to six of those conditions most critical to the restructuring process and the ranking from one to six of those conditions most difficult to achieve (item numbers 61 and 62, respectively). Cross-tabulations were calculated for these same items according to role group to determine if there was consensus *among* the three groups on these rankings. Cross-tabulations were also calculated for these items *within* each of the three role groups to determine if there was consensus among them based on current level of assignment (i.e., elementary, middle school, or high school), gender, number of years teaching, number of years as principal, number of years teaching or principals at their current school (i.e., the Partnership School), number of years as a Partnership Schools facilitator, and number of years at central office, as appropriate for each of the three role groups.

Results

A total of 256 individuals, or 84.5% responded to the questionnaire. Sixty-seven of the principals returned the questionnaire, for a total of 83.7% of the principals; 172 teachers returned the questionnaire, for a total of 84.3% of the teachers; and 17 of the 19 Partnership Schools Initiative facilitators returned the questionnaire, for a total of 89.4% of the facilitators. Respondents "strongly agreed" that 53 (or 88%) of the 60 conditions in the questionnaire facilitate the school restructuring process while they "agreed" that the remaining seven conditions facilitate the restructuring process. Thus, none of the 60 conditions had a mode of undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Conditions Most Critical to Restructuring

Questionnaire item 61 asked respondents to choose six items (conditions) from the previous list of 60 and to rank them in order of most critical to sixth most critical to restructuring based on their own experience with restructuring. Responses were analyzed both **among** the three groups as well as **within** the three groups based on a particular characteristic of a member of a role group (i.e., number of years teaching, number of years

as principal, number of years at the current school, etc.). Based on the results of the analysis of the six conditions identified by teachers, and based on the within-group analysis for teachers among the various categories, **teachers who participated in this study consistently identified the following conditions as most critical to restructuring**:

- cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school (condition number 1);
- a nonthreatening environment that supports risk-taking and encourages experimentation (condition number 2);
- initial presence of an internal leader (i.e., principal, lead teacher, central office personnel, etc.) who initiates and builds a shared commitment to change at the campus level (condition number 6);
- involvement of teachers in planning and implementing change (condition number 17); and
- time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning (condition number 41).

Based on the results of the analysis of the six conditions identified by principals, and based on the within-group analysis for principals among the various categories, **principals who participated in this study consistently identified the following conditions as most critical to restructuring:**

- cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school (condition number 1);
- a nonthreatening environment that supports risk-taking and encourages experimentation (condition number 2); and
- initial presence of an internal leader (i.e., principal, lead teacher, central office personnel, etc.) who initiates and builds a shared commitment to change at the campus level (condition number 6).

Although involvement of teachers in planning and implementing change (condition number 17) was not common to all groups within each of the five categories analyzed for principals, it was ranked among the top three conditions critical to restructuring by at least

one group within each category. This condition was also ranked as the fifth most critical to restructuring by principals as a total group.

Additionally, although support and encouragement from the superintendent for change at the campus level (condition number 25) was not common to all groups within each of the five categories analyzed for principals, it was ranked among the top three conditions most critical to restructuring for principals for one or two groups within each category.

Facilitators agreed with teachers and principals that condition numbers 1 and 6 are among the conditions most critical to restructuring.

In summary, the analysis among the three role groups as well as within each of the role groups reveals teachers, principals, and facilitators consistently agreed that condition numbers 1, 2, and 6 are most critical to the school restructuring process. Both teachers and principals also strongly supported condition number 17 as most critical to restructuring. In addition, teachers believe number 41 is critical to the restructuring process, while principals believe number 25 is critical.

Conditions Most Difficult to Achieve

Questionnaire item 62 asked respondents to choose six conditions from the previous list of 60 and to rank them in order of most difficult to achieve to sixth most difficult to achieve based on their own experience with school restructuring. Responses were analyzed both **among** the three groups as well as **within** the three groups based on a particular characteristic of a member of a role group (i.e., number of years teaching, number of years as principal, number of years at the current school, etc.). Based on the results of the analysis of the six conditions identified by teachers, and based on the within-group analysis for teachers among the various categories, **teachers who participated in this study consistently identified the following conditions as most difficult to achieve:**

- ability of staff to deal with other staff who resist change (condition number 14);
- adequate time and technical support for teachers to experiment in the classroom with new strategies and techniques (condition number 37);

- time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning (condition number 41); and
- sufficient funds committed by the district to carry out restructuring initiatives at the campus level (condition number 43).

Although cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school (condition number 1) was not common to all groups within each of the three categories analyzed for teachers, it was ranked among the top four conditions most difficult to achieve by at least one group within each category. This condition was also ranked as the fourth most difficult to achieve for teachers as a total group.

Based on the results of the analysis of the six conditions identified by principals, and based on the within-group analysis for principals among the various categories, **principals who participated in this study consistently identified the following conditions as most difficult to achieve:**

- cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school (condition number 1);
- ability of staff to deal with other staff who resist change (condition number 14);
- adequate time and technical support for teachers to experiment in the classroom with new strategies and techniques (condition number 37);
- time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning (condition number 41); and
- sufficient funds committed by the district to carry out restructuring initiatives at the campus level (condition number 43).

Facilitators agreed with teachers and principals that time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning (condition number 41) was among the conditions most difficult to achieve.

In summary, the analysis among the three role groups as well as within each of the role groups reveals both principals and teachers consistently agreed that condition numbers 14, 37, 41, and 43 are the most difficult to achieve. Teachers and principals also strongly supported condition number 1 as most difficult to achieve.

Implications for Practice

There are a number of implications applicable to professional practice related to the school restructuring process that can be derived from the results of this study. First, implications for practice are evident from the conditions identified as most critical by teachers and principals. Those who wish to engage in restructuring should heed the suggestions by principals and teachers that, without the presence of these essential conditions, restructuring initiatives will likely not be successful. School personnel at all levels, from local school board members, to the superintendent, to central office personnel, to the principal, must become fully learned in the critical nature of these conditions. They must constantly assess the presence of these conditions and must work to ensure that they are fully infused into the philosophy, culture, and daily practices of the school.

Additional implications are evident from the conditions identified by principals and teachers as most difficult to achieve. Educational personnel engaged in restructuring must seek to understand why certain conditions are difficult to achieve as it applies to their particular setting and must identify barriers to achieving them. Identification of barriers and strategies to eliminate barriers may necessitate staff development and technical assistance targeted at such for school personnel and other stakeholders involved in restructuring. Once barriers are identified and strategies are put in place to attempt to overcome the barriers, staff must continuously monitor progress toward the elimination of the barriers.

Two of the conditions identified as most critical to restructuring were also identified as most difficult to achieve: "cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school", and "time during regular working hours to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning." With this dual recognition, it would appear that these two conditions would present the greatest challenges for school personnel and would require their most creative solutions in their efforts to restructure.

Those involved in restructuring should mutually determine the **level, degree or extent** of the presence of these conditions that will be acceptable to all involved and then should continuously monitor and assess the **degree** of presence of the conditions.

Educators, parents, and business and community personnel must work together to identify the reasons for why any of these conditions might not be present to a degree that is acceptable to them. All should be prepared to take action immediately where a shortfall exists in their expectations.

Formal strategies and structures for the infusion of these conditions into the daily practices of the school; maintaining a pulse on the presence of these conditions through formative assessment; and the assistance of an external facilitator or consultant who is skilled in observing and assessing the presence or absence of these conditions may contribute toward the success of restructuring initiatives.

Additional observations were made with regard to implications pertaining specifically to external facilitators, partnerships, piloting programs and practices, and stable leadership.

External Facilitators

The findings of this study suggest that the "one-size fits all" approach to selecting an external facilitator to assist schools in major change initiatives is not appropriate. Care should be taken to select an external facilitator or consultant who is compatible with the personnel in the school and is an appropriate match in terms of background, skills, and demeanor. This implies that the facilitator should not be selected by some other external party, but rather should be selected by the personnel at the school who will be interacting with the facilitator.

Facilitators should be sufficiently trained in facilitation skills and in managing change and should be skilled in differentiating between facilitating and training. Facilitators or consultants should be flexible and skilled in adaptation so that they can adjust and modify their advice and programs to meet the needs of the individual client school.

Partnerships

Relatively few schools have aggressively sought to establish a variety of partnerships, nor or all partnerships with other entities viewed as favorable relationships. Formalized structures for forming, establishing, and continuing partnerships are essential

for the development of meaningful, mutually beneficial partnerships. Each partnership should serve a specific purpose or aim; such purpose or aim should be carefully assessed by school personnel before attempting to establish a partnership.

Recognizing that not all partnerships are equally beneficial, meaningful, or for the same purpose, both partners should come to a complete and full understanding of what each member's goals and expectations of the partnership are, as well as what benefits each partner hopes to receive from the partnership. Schools should go beyond the traditional "Adopt-A-School" model to establish non-traditional models of partnership with a variety of partners.

Piloting Programs or Practices

Teachers apparently understand the benefits derived from piloting programs or practices before full implementation. Principals and external facilitators also need to understand the benefits derived from piloting programs or practices before full implementation on campus.

Principals should be fully aware of the new practices or programs and should be trained in the philosophy and implementation of the new practices and programs alongside teachers. Principals should require regular progress reports from teachers who are piloting new programs and practices. This will help keep the principal informed of any problems as well as of any successes with the pilot.

Principals should allow the pilot to take its full course unless it has been determined that the new programs or practices are causing harm to someone. Principals should ensure that a complete, meaningful evaluation is conducted at the conclusion of the pilot to determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of the new program or practice before deciding against full implementation.

Stable Leadership

Several teachers who participated in this study commented on the importance of visionary leadership that is stable over a period of time. Unstable leadership of the superintendent or the principal can be a major barrier to reform. When leaders change, the

consensus around where a school is going and how it is going to get there often changes with them. This may warrant measures by the local school board to reduce turnover and increase longevity of district and campus leaders. It may also warrant training for new leaders to empower them with the necessary information about school reform (SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1994).

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to provide critical and practical information to schools engaged in the restructuring process, as well as to educators who provide leadership and support to schools engaged in restructuring. Educators know, as with any attempts at major change, that not all reform or restructuring efforts will be successful. The lack of success may be attributed, however, to the absence of some or many of the conditions that were identified in this study as critical to the school restructuring process.

The findings of this study offer the beginnings of a structure for thinking about (Porter and Osthoff, 1993) the conditions that facilitate the school restructuring process from a comprehensive viewpoint. Educators engaged in school restructuring can embed these conditions into the strategies or model for school improvement they have selected for restructuring, taking "the restructuring movement beyond mere rhetoric" (Tye, 1992, p. 14) into actual practice in the classroom and school.

Bibliography

Anderson, B. (1993). The stages of systemic change. Educational Leadership, 51(1), 14-17.

Aronstein, L. W., Marlow, M., and Desilets, B. (1990). Detours on the road to site-based management. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 61-63.

Bacharach, S. B. (1988). Four themes of reform: An editorial essay. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(4), 484-496.

Banks, C. A. McGee (1993). Restructuring schools for equity: What we have learned in two decades. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(1), 42-48.

Barth, R. (1990). Improving Schools from Within. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bell, T. H. (1993). Reflections one decade after a *Nation At Risk*. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(8), 592-597.

Bernd, M. (1992). Shared decision making requires effective instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 76(540), 64-69.

Blum, R. E., and Kneidek, A. W. (1991). Strategic improvement that focuses on student achievement. Educational Leadership, 48(7), 17-21.

Bonstingl, J. J. (1992). The total quality classroom. Educational Leadership, 49(6), 66-70.

Borg, W. R. and Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction, Fifth Edition. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bredeson, P. V. (1993). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructured schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(1), 34-68.

Busick, K. U., and Inos, R. H. (1992). Synthesis of the Research on Educational Change: Implementation Phase. Pacific Region Educational Laboratory, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Caldwell, S. D., and Wood, F. H. (1988). School-based improvement -- Are we ready? Educational Leadership, 46(2), 50-53.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Forum.

Carruthers, G. (July 1990). Sharing Responsibility for Success. Education Commission of the States.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., and Astuto, T. A. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 41-68.

Closer (January 1994, Number 4). Chicago School Reform. Designs for Change, Chicago, Ill.

Cohen, M. (1988). Restructuring the Education System: Agenda for the 1990s. Results in Education series, Center for Policy Research, National Governors Association.

Coppedge, F. L. (1993). Excellence in education -- Meeting the challenge with effective practices. NASSP Bulletin, 77(554), 34-40.

Corbett, H. D. (1990). On the Meaning of Restructuring. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Corcoran, T. B., and Rouk, U. (November 1985). Using Natural Channels for School Improvement: A Report on Four Years of the Urban Development Program. A Report for the National Institute of Education. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Cornett, L. M. (1995). Lessons from 10 years of teacher improvement reforms. Educational Leadership, 52(5), 26-30.

Cuban, L. (1992). What happens to reforms that last? The case of the junior high school. American Educational Research Journal, 29(2), 227-251.

Dagley, D. L. (1993). Education as an essential federal function: A constitutional and legal perspective on educational reform. Planning and Changing, 24(1/2), 60-68.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(10), 753-761.

David, J. L. (1991a). Restructuring and Technology. Partners in change. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(1), 37-40, 78-82.

David, J. L. (1991b). What it takes to restructure education. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 11-15.

David, J. L. (1994). Transforming State Education Agencies to Support Educational Reform. National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research.

David, J. L., Cohen, M., Honetschlager, D., and Traiman, S. (1990). State Actions to Restructure Schools: First Steps. Center for Policy Research, National Governors' Association.

Donahoe, T. (1993). Finding the way: Structure, time, and culture in school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 75(4), 298-305.

Donaldson, Jr., G. A. (1993). Working smarter together. Educational Leadership, 51(2), 12-16.

Eastwood, K. W., and Louis, K. S. (1992). Restructuring that lasts: Managing the performance dip. Journal of School Leadership, 2(2), 212-224.

Education Commission of the States (1992a). Creating visions and standards to support them. Restructuring the Education System series. Denver, CO.

Education Commission of the States (1992b). Bringing coherence to state policy. Restructuring the Education System series. Denver, CO.

Education Commission of the States (1992c). Building private sector and community support. Restructuring the Education System series. Denver, CO.

Education Commission of the States and the Rockefeller Foundation in partnership with RJR Nabisco Foundation (November 15, 1990). School Restructuring: What the Reformers Are Saying. Washington , D. C.

Elmore, R. F. (1988). Early experience in restructuring schools: voices from the field. Results in Education series. Center for Policy Research, National Governors' Association.

Evans, R. (1993). The human face of reform. Educational Leadership, 51(1), 19-23.

Fernandez, J. A. (1991). From the superintendent's perspective. In J. H. Hansen and E. Liftin, (Eds.), School Restructuring: A Practitioner's Guide. Swampscott, MA.: Watersun Publishing Company.

Fox, C. A. Fawcett. (1992). The critical ingredients of making change happen. NASSP Bulletin, 76(541), 71-77.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 391-421.

Gay, L. R. (1992). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Goldwasser, M. (1993). Are all the wagons headed west? Practitioners' and policymakers' roles in the restructuring enterprise. Planning and Changing, 24(1/2), 101-124.

Hall, G., and Galluzzo, G. (November 1991). Changing Policy Into Practice: School-Based Decisionmaking. State Policy Program, Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Heckman, P. E. (1993). School restructuring in practice: Reckoning with the culture of school. International Journal of Educational Reform, 2(3), 263-271.

Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., Bliss, J., and Hoy, W. K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. Journal of School Leadership, 4(5), 484-501.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., and West, M. (1994). School Improvement in an Era of Change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Huberman, M., and Crandall, D. (1982). People, policies and practices, examining the chain of school improvement. Vol. 9. Implications for action, a study of dissemination efforts supporting school improvement. Andover, MA: The Network.

Johnson, W. L., Snyder, K. J., and Anderson, R. H. (1992). Organizational productivity and the school-based restructuring challenge. Journal of Staff Development. 13(4), 46-49.

Kilbourne, L., Decker, L. E., and Romney, V. A. (August 1994). Rebuilding the Partnership for Public Education. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Killion, J. P., and Simmons, L. A. (1992). The zen of facilitation. Journal of Staff Development, 13(3), 2-5.

Kirst, M. W. (1993). Strengths and weaknesses of American education. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(8), 613-618.

Leibensperger, W. (1994). School restructuring. The Clearing House, 68(2), 105-106.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Silins, H., and Dart, B. (Winter 1993). Using the appraisal of school leaders as an instrument for school restructuring. Peabody Journal of Education, 68(2), 85-109.

Lieberman, A., and Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(10), 759-764.

Louis, K. S., and Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving The Urban High School: What Works and Why. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Loucks, S. F., Bauchner, J. E., Crandall, D. P., Schmidt, W. H., and Eiseman, J. W. (1982). People, Policies, and Practices: Examining the Chain of School Improvement, Volume 1: Setting the Stage for a Study of School Improvement. Andover, MA: The Network, Inc.

MacPhail-Wilcox, B., Forbes, R., and Parramore, B. (1990). Project design: Reforming structure and process. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 22-25.

Mannan, G., and Blackwell, J. (1992). Parent involvement: Barriers and opportunities. The Urban Review, 24(3), 219-226.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19(9), 11-16.

Mentell, E. J. (1993). Implementing site-based management: Overcoming the obstacles. NASSP Bulletin, 77(555), 97-102.

Murphy, Joseph (1990). Restructuring America's Schools. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory and Nashville, TN: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Murphy, Joseph (1991). Restructuring Schools: Capturing and Assessing the Phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, Joseph (1993). Restructuring schools in Kentucky: Insights from superintendents. Planning and Changing, 24(3/4), 190-204.

National School Boards Association and Office of Federal and National Education Issues Advocacy (1993). Restructuring Reform and Reality: What School Districts Are Really Doing. NSBA Best Practices Series.

Newman, J. B. (Summer 1992). Student involvement in school restructuring. ERS Spectrum, 10(3), 19-22.

Newmann, F. M. (1991). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(6), 458-463.

Newmann, F. M. (1993). Beyond common sense in educational restructuring: The issues of content and linkage. Educational Researcher, 22(2), 4-13.

O'Neil, J. (1990). Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 4-10.

Odden, E. R., and Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. Educational Leadership, 52(5), 32-36.

Pajak, E. F., and Glickman, C. D. (1989). Dimensions of school district improvement. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 61-64.

Peca, K. (1994). Focusing on the Individual Change Process in School Restructuring. Keynote address presented at the Texas Education Agency Institute on Reaching All Students: Building School District Capacity. Portales, NM: Eastern New Mexico University.

Pitsch, M. (1991). Partners: Schools and colleges forge new bonds to advance reform. Teacher Magazine, November/December 1991.

Porter, A., and Osthoff, E. (1993). External Strategies for Stimulating and Supporting School Restructuring. Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Prestine, N. A., and Bowen, C. (1993). Benchmarks of change: Assessing essential school restructuring efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15(3), 298-319.

Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. American Educational Research Journal, 31(2), 283-307.

Rowley, S. R. (1991). A new mindset for restructuring schools. NASSP Bulletin, 75(537), 28-32.

Sa, S. (1992). Another foundation goes to school: The Panasonic Foundation's school restructuring program. Teachers College Record, 93(3), 463-471.

Sarason, S. B. (1972). The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sashkin, M., and Egermeier, J. (1992). School Change Models and Processes: A Review and Synthesis of Research and Practice. Working paper, Programs for the Improvement of Practice.

Shoemaker, J. (1986). Developing effectiveness in the district, school and classroom. Equity and Choice, II(2), 27-34.

Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. Education, 114(4), 488-492.

Short, P. M., and Greer, J. T. (1994). Empowering students: Variables impacting the effort. Education, 114(4), 503-517.

Slotnik, W. J. (1993). Core concepts of reform. The Executive Educator, 15(12), 32-34.

SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (September 8, 1994). Overcoming Barriers to School Reform in the Southeast.

Thompson, D. C. (1992). School improvement and student outcomes: A resource perspective. Planning and Changing, 23(3), 174-188.

Timar, T. (1989). The politics of school restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 265-275.

Tushnet, N. C. (1991). School Restructuring: Why Don't We Heed the Lessons of the Past? Austin, TX: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Tye, K. A. (1992). Restructuring our schools: Beyond the rhetoric. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(1), 8-14.

United States Department of Education (August 1991). From Effective Schools to Restructuring: A Literature Review. Prepared for the U. S. Department of Education under contract by SRI International, Menlo Park, CA.

United States Department of Education (1995). Improving Schools From the Bottom Up: From Effective Schools To Restructuring. Washington, D. C.

Wise, A. E. (1990). Six steps to teacher professionalism. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 57-60.

CONDITIONS
FOR
SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

School restructuring can be a confusing and frustrating experience given the ambiguity of the meaning of restructuring and the massive volume of literature on the subject. This questionnaire deals with the **"context"** or **process** of restructuring; it does not deal with the "content" of restructuring. Your responses to the questionnaire will help establish a set of conditions that are most critical to the school restructuring **process**. Teachers and administrators in Texas and across the nation engaged in restructuring will benefit from the results of the study.

Please answer the questions from your perspective as a (1) teacher; (2) principal; or (3) PSI Facilitator, depending upon your current assignment. For your convenience, the questions are grouped according to major categories. Please also note the questionnaire is printed on both sides of the paper. Feel free to contact me at the address or phone number below should you have any questions about the questionnaire.

Thank you for your participation.

Earin M. Martin, Researcher
5301 Waterbrook Drive
Austin, Texas 78723
(512) 463-9272

Dr. Nancy Roser, Supervising Professor
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
University of Texas at Austin
(512) 471-4041

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONDITIONS FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

RESTRUCTURING EXPERTS DEBATE THE SET OF CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING. BELOW IS A LIST OF CONDITIONS. BASED ON YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE WITH RESTRUCTURING, PLEASE INDICATE FOR EACH CONDITION THE EXTENT OF YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT THAT THE CONDITION FACILITATES THE COMPREHENSIVE RESTRUCTURING PROCESS. CIRCLE SA FOR STRONGLY AGREE; A FOR AGREE; U FOR UNDECIDED; D FOR DISAGREE; OR SD FOR STRONGLY DISAGREE.

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

ENVIRONMENT FOR CHANGE

1. Cooperation and trust between and among all levels of personnel at the school	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. A nonthreatening environment that supports risk taking and encourages experimentation	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. The capacity of staff to define problems and to develop strategies to deal with the problems	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Willingness and ability of staff to seek **non-standard** solutions to problems	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. Communication, interaction, and information sharing among school staff and partners in restructuring	SA	A	U	D	SD

CHANGE PROCESS

6. **Initial** presence of an internal leader (i.e., principal, lead teacher, central office personnel, etc.) who **initiates** and builds a shared commitment to change at the campus level	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. **Continuing** presence of an internal leader who **sustains** staff commitment and motivation for restructuring initiatives **over the long haul**	SA	A	U	D	SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

8. Presence of an **external** consultant/facilitator (such as the ESC Partnership Schools Facilitator) to facilitate change at the campus level ..... SA A U D SD

9. Trust by the external consultant/facilitator in the group's ability to find its own direction and resolution ..... SA A U D SD

10. A clear and shared understanding among staff of what restructuring means for their school ..... SA A U D SD

11. Ongoing examination by staff of beliefs and practices to determine if they contribute toward meeting established goals ..... SA A U D SD

12. Examination by staff of the effect a change in one area of the school would have on all other areas of the school ..... SA A U D SD

13. Understanding of the **culture** (values and beliefs) of a particular school ..... SA A U D SD

14. Ability of staff to deal with other staff who resist change ..... SA A U D SD

VISION

15. Development of the **vision** in collaboration with:

    a. all school staff ..... SA A U D SD

    b. parents ..... SA A U D SD

    c. business and community representatives ..... SA A U D SD

PLANNING

16. Opportunity by staff to assess whether the proposed restructuring is really necessary and important ..... SA A U D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

17. Involvement of **teachers** in planning and implementing change ..... SA A U D SD

18. A sense of collective ownership felt by staff for the school restructuring plan ..... SA A U D SD

19. Regular opportunities by staff for data analysis and problem solving as the school works through its restructuring plan ..... SA A U D SD

SUPPORT/LEADERSHIP

20. Leadership support from the **state** department of education (such as the Partnership Schools Initiative staff at TEA) ..... SA A U D SD

21. **Waivers** from state rules and regulations ..... SA A U D SD

22. Realignment of **district policies** to promote restructuring at the **campus** level ..... SA A U D SD

23. Support and encouragement by **school board** members for teachers to be creative and innovative in the classroom ..... SA A U D SD

24. **Piloting** of programs or elements before full implementation on campus ..... SA A U D SD

25. Support and encouragement from the **superintendent** for change at the campus level ..... SA A U D SD

26. Technical support from **central office staff** for campus restructuring efforts ..... SA A U D SD

27. Authority of the principal to select or retain staff who have the same philosophy, values, and goals ..... SA A U D SD

28. A climate of collegiality, collaboration, and professionalism among staff created by the principal ..... SA A U D SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

29. Motivation and commitment to change generated by the principal	SA	A	U	D	SD
30. Effective use by the principal of procedures for problem solving and decision making	SA	A	U	D	SD
31. Active involvement by **teachers** and other staff in site-based decision making	SA	A	U	D	SD
32. Determination by staff of how **funds** are used for restructuring initiatives	SA	A	U	D	SD
33. Authority of staff to make decisions about how to best educate their students	SA	A	U	D	SD
34. Regular **communication** by the principal and teachers **with other campus or district personnel** engaged in restructuring	SA	A	U	D	SD
35. Staff **visitation** of other campuses to observe best practices and restructuring activities	SA	A	U	D	SD
36. A strong sense of "self-efficacy" on the part of **teachers** (i.e., teachers know that they have the skills and ability to help students learn)	SA	A	U	D	SD
37. Adequate **time** and **technical support** for teachers to experiment in the classroom with new strategies and techniques	SA	A	U	D	SD
38. Encouragement of **teachers** to use their own strengths and talents in carrying out restructuring initiatives	SA	A	U	D	SD
39. Participation by **students** in site-based decision making activities	SA	A	U	D	SD
40. A belief by **students** that it is acceptable to make mistakes, take risks, and experiment with new ideas	SA	A	U	D	SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

RESOURCES/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

41. **Time during regular working hours** to participate in shared decision making, professional development, and team planning	SA	A	U	D	SD
42. Additional days or hours beyond the regular contract with supplemental pay to participate in staff development and planning	SA	A	U	D	SD
43. Sufficient **funds** committed by the **district** to carry out restructuring initiatives at the campus level	SA	A	U	D	SD
44. Various kinds of **technology** available in the school and in the classroom as part of restructuring	SA	A	U	D	SD
45. Staff development for teachers that is based on **campus** needs and is designed to meet the **level** of training needed by teachers	SA	A	U	D	SD
46. Staff development for teachers on ways to use **technology** in the classroom	SA	A	U	D	SD
47. Staff development that focuses on changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	SA	A	U	D	SD
48. Staff development for assuming new roles and responsibilities associated with restructuring, such as group decision making, conflict resolution, and problem solving	SA	A	U	D	SD
49. **Follow-up training** to ensure new practices are properly implemented in the classroom	SA	A	U	D	SD
50. **Mentoring and coaching** for teachers to help them become proficient in new instructional techniques	SA	A	U	D	SD

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNDECIDED
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

PARTNERSHIPS

51. Meaningful, **mutually beneficial** partnerships with **a variety of business and community partners** ..... SA A U D SD

52. Collaboration with **business** partners in determining what students need to know to be prepared for work ..... SA A U D SD

53. Active involvement of parents from diverse backgrounds in a variety of school activities ..... SA A U D SD

54. Consideration of **cultural differences** in planning and conducting parent and community involvement activities ..... SA A U D SD

ASSESSMENT OF RESTRUCTURING INITIATIVES

55. **Measurement of progress** toward accomplishment of the objectives and intended results of restructuring ..... SA A U D SD

56. Collection by staff of many kinds of **data** on school performance and acting on the information accordingly ..... SA A U D SD

57. Measurement of the impact of **staff development** on changes in the classroom ..... SA A U D SD

58. **Celebration** of successes and accomplishments ..... SA A U D S

TEACHING AND LEARNING

59. Implementation in the classroom of new and innovative teaching and learning practices ..... SA A U D SD

60. Reliance on **research** of what works and what doesn't work in the classroom when making instructional decisions ..... SA A U D SD

61. From all of the items mentioned in numbers 1 - 60 above, which six do you think have been the most **critical** to facilitating the restructuring process in **your** school? (Put one item number in each box.) Comment beside each if you choose.

☐ Most Critical

☐ Second Most Critical

☐ Third Most Critical

☐ Fourth Most Critical

☐ Fifth Most Critical

☐ Sixth Most Critical

62. From all of the items mentioned in numbers 1 - 60 above, which six do you think have been the most **difficult** to achieve? (Put one item number in each box.) Comment beside each if you choose.

☐ Most Difficult

☐ Second Most Difficult

☐ Third Most Difficult

☐ Fourth Most Difficult

☐ Fifth Most Difficult

☐ Sixth Most Difficult

DEMOGRAPHICS:

FOR ALL QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS:

1. **Current position** (check one):
   ____ Teacher
   ____ Principal
   ____ ESC Partnership Schools Facilitator

2. **Current Assignment** (check one - leave blank if PSI facilitator):
   ____ Pre-K - Elementary School
   ____ Middle/Jr. High School
   ____ High School

3. **ESC Region No.** in which you are located: _____

4. **Gender**: ____ Male ____ Female

FOR TEACHERS ONLY:

5a. Total number of years **teaching** (check one):
   _____ 0 - 2 years
   _____ 3 - 5 years
   _____ 6 - 10 years
   _____ 11 - 15 years
   _____ 16 - 20 years
   _____ 21 or more years

5b. Number of years **teaching** at your **current school** (check one):
   _____ 0 - 2 years
   _____ 3 - 5 years
   _____ 6 - 10 years
   _____ 11 - 15 years
   _____ 16 - 20 years
   _____ 21 or more years

5c. You were selected for participation in this study by your principal because of your significant involvement in restructuring as part of the Partnership Schools Initiative (PSI). How would you best describe the group of which you are a member that made most of the decisions related to restructuring issues as part of the PSI? (check one):
   _____ Site-Based Decision Making Committee
   _____ Campus Improvement Committee
   _____ PSI or Restructuring Committee
   _____ Other (please describe): _____

5d. How many total **teachers** are members of the group you checked in number 5c? _____

FOR PRINCIPALS ONLY:

6a. Total number of years as **principal** (check one):

_____ 0 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

6b. Number of years as **principal** at your **current school** (check one):

_____ 0 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

6c. Total number of years **teaching** (check one):

_____ 1 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

FOR PSI FACILITATORS ONLY:

7a. Total number of years **teaching** (check one):

_____ Have not been a teacher
_____ 0 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

7b. Total number of years as **principal** (check one):

_____ Have not been a principal
_____ 0 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

7c. Total number of years as **PSI Facilitator** (check one):

_____ Less than 1 year
_____ 1 year
_____ 2 years
_____ 3 years
_____ 4 years

7d. Total number of years at **central office** (check one):

_____ Have not been at central office
_____ 0 - 2 years
_____ 3 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 - 15 years
_____ 16 - 20 years
_____ 21 or more years

Please use the back of this page to write briefly about your own experience with restructuring and what you believe to be important for the process to be successful.